

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPEL

we borrow to spend more than we take in, we inflate, that is, cheapen, our money. Inflation again hurts most those in the lower income groups.

Challenge on fiscal responsibility: The minority report on the Housing bill, prepared by Republican Members, points it up as, "a clear-cut challenge to the Congress on the question of fiscal responsibility." The minority said, "Even the title of the bill—Emergency Home Ownership Act—condemns this proposal. There simply is no emergency. Last year our economy and the well-being of our people moved to new highs. Virtually all competent observers agree that this year will be even better. And yet, under this bill, a billion dollar back-door raid would be made on the Treasury for the purchase of mortgages at subsidy prices. In this time of prosperity, fiscal responsibility requires that the Congress achieve a noninflationary Federal budget. Irresponsible spending proposals of this type must be stopped."

New housing starts are not the whole picture: In considering the role of housing in our economy, one important fact should not be overlooked. New housing construction is only one part of the picture. People also become homeowners by buying existing homes and get better homes by expenditures for modernization. A breakdown of the \$15 billion in loans made by member institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board last year shows only a third of that money borrowed for new home construction. The rest of it went into purchases of existing homes and for repair and remodeling. The liberals were playing a housing starts numbers game by alluding to only one part of the picture in presenting the Housing bill.

Indiana Congressman CHARLES HALLECK, Republican leader, summed the thing up pretty succinctly stating, "The bill represented a billion dollars worth of bait." Needless to say, the bill cleared the House by a vote of 214 to 163. Should the Senate pass it as well, it faces an almost certain Presidential veto, but will remain very much alive as an election issue.

Figures in last week's newsletter: Last week the figure for the foreign aid bureaucracy was given as 12,500 people; actually, the foreign aid program gives employment to more than 50,000 people; a figure I hope, desperately, we can reduce.

Military Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Anthony Harrigan of the Charleston News and Courier—America's most independent newspaper—has written an excellent article titled "Military Leadership." His splendid article, appearing in the Charleston News and Courier under date of May 1, 1960, calls the attention of the Nation to the magnificent contribution our military leaders have made to freedom and in keeping America safe.

When this world witnesses the mistakes this Nation has made on the advice of certain civilians in the diplomatic field, the Nation should thank God for its military statesmen.

The article follows:

MILITARY LEADERSHIP

(By Anthony Harrigan)

It used to be said that war is too serious a business to be left to the generals. But nowadays it seems that the military mind offers the best hope of this world-embattled Nation.

It is the generals and the admirals—men such as Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, former Army Chief of Staff; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. C. P. Cabell, USAF, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency—who are helping the Nation face the totality of Communist aggression.

These men study the threat to the national security—it is their profession—and know how the enemy works from the Caribbean to the China Sea.

In refreshing contrast to the State Department's refusal to face the facts in Cuba is the statement of General Cabell in an appearance before Senate Committee on the Judiciary that "collaboration with and infiltration of popular movements, for example that of Batista in the 1930's and of Castro in the 1950's, has been communism's most effective weapon in Latin America."

General Cabell boldly stated that the "so-called national liberation strategy seeks to offset Communist numerical and political weakness through international organizational support and clandestine techniques of infiltration and coordination."

Military leaders like General Cabell are trying, in the face of foolish talk of coexistence, to explain to the American public how this Nation is at war and that the hour is late for counterattacks against the enemy.

One hopes that the American public will listen carefully to the statements of these military men. They serve as pathfinders and guides to the American people that must make transitions in thought and action in the years ahead.

The counsel of the military is in marked contrast to the unrealistic discussions of those civilian elements who urge disarmament and coexistence and who would block U.S. action by spreading fear of a nuclear holocaust.

The appearance of Castro, the H-bomb protest marchers, the advocates of recognition of Red China, the friends of vast U.S. financed United Nations programs (as a substitute for military defenses) are all of one mind. They would have the United States accept coexistence with the Communist enemy and act passively and appeasingly before Red imperialism.

The American people should ignore the counsel of passivity before a terrible threat. They should remember George Washington's advice "to choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel."

The military leaders of the United States understand that this Nation cannot win the war with communism by thinking or acting with passivity. They know that conflict cannot be avoided by any treaty, any scrap of paper or verbal agreement with the Soviet enemy. Conflict is the history of mankind. It is the history of our own time. We haven't the option now to choose whether or not we want war; we have it—and right in our own hemisphere.

Edmund S. Whitman, vice president of the United Fruit Co., an American company whose properties in Cuba were recently confiscated for Soviet-style collectives, has said:

"The international Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere acts like the buzzards. The disciplined agents from Moscow hover over a country waiting for it to soften up to a point where they can move in and devour it. . . . The disciplined foreign agents know how to roll with the punch. Their ring tactics are highly flexible. Thus, when a movement by force fails, they adopt

existence. That is the stratagem the free world is confronted with today."

Thus it is absurd for civilian officials to talk about avoiding all war. The task of true national leaders is not to run from conflict but to strengthen the will to win. They also have the task of shaping national policy in such a way that the outcome of the protracted war with communism will be favorable to the United States.

The transitions in thought and action that the military can help the American public make are from absurdity to realism in foreign relations.

American ideas about national conflict are vague and lacking in realism. The American approach to foreign relations is that peace and mutual satisfaction is natural among nations. Many citizens have the unsound notion that because various territories have their own flag that all nations are morally equal, that self-determination is a basic right the United States should respect in all instances.

This is folly. Castro's Cuba is not deserving of the same kind of respect as Canada. Neither is national self-determination in Castro's Cuba, where a Communist-front regime controls, as valid as it is in England.

That every people has the right to choose its own kind of government, to go its own way—as in Castro's case forging links with Red China and the U.S.S.R.—is a notion that handicaps the United States in its struggle to preserve freedom against Communist tyranny. It is this notion that leave the United States unable to decide between the claims of an old friend and a new nation.

The Algerian situation is a case in point. The peculiar idea prevails that the Algerian rebels, who accepted aid from Red China's military advisers and who engage in terrorism, are deserving of no less consideration than France, a pillar of Western civilization.

Too often a spurious moralism becomes involved in national policy as a result of foolish ideas about the sovereignty and rights of foreign states. War becomes in this view, a way to protect rights that are illusory.

Thus, after World War I President Wilson considered not U.S. strategic needs but the alleged rights of various Balkan peoples. At the conclusion of World War II, the same error was repeated.

America's Dutch allies were forced out of the East Indies. The result was a Javanese Government that is leftist and no ally of the United States. The spurious moralism resulted in denial of military aid to Chiang Kai-shek with the harrowing result of the loss of free China to world communism.

Imprecise, pseudo-moralistic aims have been the undoing of the United States since World War II. The only cautionary force in the United States have been the professional military people. The determination to hold Formosa stemmed from the military instance on its necessity. The Panama Canal Zone is still under firm U.S. control because the military regard it as essential. Spain is a free world bastion, no longer scorned by the U.S. Government because the military know its importance for air and naval bases. And Cuba may be liberated from Castro because the Navy considers its Guantanamo base of too great importance to lose.

America's best military minds share the idea that Prime Minister Palmerston once enunciated, namely that "England has no permanent friends; England has no permanent enemies; England has only permanent interests." If the United States keeps its eyes on its strategic interests, leaving aside other considerations, it will be able to resist Communist attack.

Despite good counsel from the military, U.S. opinion is still a captive of the one-worlders, the coexisters, and the America

A3726

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 2

lasters. Because of this the United States fares ill in foreign affairs. It will continue to fare badly until realism dominates in our national councils, and that means until the military, which is to say the strategic point of view, is more widely appreciated.

As George Santayana, the philosopher said, "Those who will not learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

What the American people must learn is to look at the world around them in a new way. They must look at it, with the United States and its interests always at the center—with one goal always in mind—U.S. survival.

The military leaders of the United States can play a great role in the education of Americans by constantly reminding their fellow citizens that the cold war they are in is the protracted war of communism against freedom.

This war may continue for decades; the enemy's unchanging objective is defeat of the United States. "We will bury you," said Nikita Khrushchev. The only thing that will change is the method of Communist attack. It may be conventional military operations, subversion, or the cultivation of a public philosophy of weakness, defeatism and appeasement in the United States.

The military leaders of the United States can serve their countrymen by stressing time and again that in the struggle against communism there is no substitute for victory.

Realism of Idealism—The Only Way To Deal Successfully With World Communism Based on Atheistic Materialism and Cynicism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the distinguished Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. The article itself illustrates the high idealism guided by practical realism on the part of Dr. Harris which in the article he so properly commends. The article from the Washington Star of May 1, 1960 follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—REALISM OF IDEALISM
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

In the present world situation we need idealist who see visions and dream dreams. But we desperately need idealists who are also realists. The dictionary tells us that idealism is "the tendency to see things as they should be instead of as they are," and that realism is "the tendency to concern oneself with actuality of fact." A surgeon is an idealist who is also a realist. He isn't the sort of idealist who puts a mustard plaster over a malignancy and just hopes for the best. He knows that some things have to be cut out before the recuperative powers of the body have a chance to be mobilized.

Those who understand the present peril the world is in because of the malignant growth of atheistic communism are idealists who dream of a healed and happy world, but who vividly realize that you cannot compromise with a cancer in the body politic. Bishop Gerald Kennedy of the Methodist Church is

both an idealist and a realist. Returning to America after recent weeks in Soviet Russia, he declares: "The issue is joined at last. Either God is or He is not. Either a man is of value only as a citizen of the state or he is of value because God created him. Either Christianity is true or communism is true, but not both. Coexistence is a pleasant term, but one of these systems is going down."

Again and again church leaders have failed their time tragically, because they were unreal idealists. Sincere church people were back of a British Prime Minister when he went to Munich with an umbrella, but with no righteous sword. It was then that for "peace in our time" a glorious little democracy in the heart of Europe was thrown to the wolves of appeasement. And now, in this year of our Lord 1960, there are religious leaders—especially ecclesiastical bureaucrats—who are as gullible and blind as were the church leaders to whom Jesus spoke sadly. The Master said to the leaders of His day, "You can prophesy about the weather. You read the signs in the sky, but you cannot read the signs of the times." Now, remember, He was talking to religious leaders when He said: "If thou hadst known in this, thy day, the things which belong to thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes, for the time shall come upon thee that thine enemies shall lay thee even with the ground and shall not leave one stone upon another because thou knowest not the time of thy visitation." And Christ's dismal prophecy came to pass when the armies of Titus pulverized Jerusalem. Jesus' heart was heavy because those at the head of the church were not reading aright the signs of the times.

A leading professor in one of our best-known theological schools some time ago issued a petulant, scolding message to all the churches. Because it had in it idealism without realism the statement might just as well have been written in the Kremlin. This is exactly what he said: "We should avoid a position of hostility to them (that is, to the regimes of Russia and China) and cease the practice of moralizing and the practice of continual lectures to them by our leaders." What that church leader is really saying is let the Red secret police arrest innocent peasants by the truckload; let the interrogators brainwash and torture them; let the official butchers kill, or perhaps merely send them to a slave camp where the terrified peasants will be reformed through labor. But—let no gentle Christian in America whose life by comparison is a bed of roses say a rough or accusing word about such atrocities. To do that might postpone the time when Red China will be received into the United Nations as peace lovers. And then to thus speak out will interfere with Russia's ideas of coexistence. All that is idealism without realism. Now I can tell you, out of my personal knowledge, that to the enslaved people of the captive countries for the missionaries of the Cross in Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines, and for all those across Asia yearning for freedom, that sort of a call from church leaders in America advising padlocks on the lips of our churches is frightening, disturbing, and devastating to the morale of Christian churches in those lands.

I am not charging that any of these mistaken church leaders are Communists. I do not go into that controversy at all. I am simply saying that the thinking of some who are as prominent today as spokesmen for the church as the Pharisees were in Christ's day is akin to those to whom the Master said: "You do not rightly discern the signs of the times."

The thing that alarms me is so much idealism divorced from realism is that so many in the religious forces of the Nation seem to be affected by a moral flabbiness, an absence of indignation at appalling

crimes, a tendency to forget, not as God forgets when there is genuine repentance, but a forgetting which indicates a sort of moral blackout—a willingness to grasp unrepentant, bloodstained hands in cooperation and partnership.

With the precious things we hold nearest our hearts being attacked by sinister forces without pity or conscience, let us pray every day as this struggle rages: "From a dangerous idealism bleached of the common sense of a sanctified realism, good Lord, deliver us."

The Folly of the Buy-European Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 13, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, my thoughts turn to the folly of the buy-European program because of a letter written by one of my constituents to Mr. Charles Coe, editor of the Whitewater (Wis.) Register. The letter is set forth as follows:

MARCH 23, 1960.

Mr. CHARLES COE,
Whitewater Register,
Whitewater, Wis.

DEAR CHARLES: I do not know whether this information is of interest to your readers or not. Sometimes I think there is no interest, again I believe there is interest but they do not know what to do about it.

As you know 80 percent of our production is in plastics. We have just received a letter from the Society of the Plastic Industry telling us that a total of 6,547,000 plastic raincoats were imported to the United States from Japan and other foreign countries in 1959. When this is a broken down against our labor in Whitewater it means a total of 4 coats per hour or a total of 818 people working 40 hours per week for 1 year's time.

This is what is happening to the plastic raincoat industries in the United States. Now, this is but a small example, what about the 1,001 other products and industries in the United States where imports are taking command.

I would think that if politicians and union leaders would get out and promise relief and fight this infiltration of foreign goods it would mean a lot more to our economy than many of the things being promised and offered to get votes.

It can only mean that many a worker will be seeking unemployment compensation and then relief if this situation continues. Any worker that goes out and buys foreign products is asking for trouble, as we cannot have our cake and eat it too. I am beginning to think we should again think in terms of "Buy America First."

Very truly yours,

LEO PERRY.

It has been brought to my attention, through a committee in which I serve, that this country is a customer for 12,000 fishing vessels in the next 10 years. These vessels can be bought in foreign shipyards for one-half of what they can be purchased for in this country. Our committee is informed that it is the policy of the administration to permit these fishing vessels to be purchased in foreign shipyards. Our committee is almost unanimously opposed to this policy. I have a special interest in that particular